

DEC 18 2006

Atty. Docket No.: LYRN002USO
Customer ID No. 58,293**REMARKS:**

Claims 32-59 are currently pending in the application. Claims 32-34, 36-47, 49, 50 and 52-59 have been rejected. Claims 35, 48 and 51 have been objected to as depending from a rejected claim, but have been indicated to be allowable by the Examiner. New claims 60-87 have been added with this response. Claims 32-59 have been cancelled with this response.

Claim 51, which was deemed allowable by the Examiner, has been essentially rewritten herein in independent form as new claim 60, from which new claims 61-67 depend.

Claim 48, which was deemed allowable by the Examiner, has been essentially rewritten herein in independent form as new claim 68, from which new claims 69-77 depend.

Claim 52, which was deemed allowable by the Examiner (subject to overcoming the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph), has been essentially rewritten herein in independent form as new claim 78, from which new claims 79-87 depend.

Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claims 52-59 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite is respectfully requested.

The Examiner argues that claim 52 omits essential steps. In particular, the Examiner questions how modulus C is tied to the calculations performed in claim 32, and notes that claim 52 appears to be more closely related to the steps recited in claim 33.

Claims 52-59 have been cancelled with this response, and have been rewritten in independent form as claims 78-87. New claim 78, from which claims 79-87 depend, includes the essential limitations of claim 33 (including the limitations of base claim 32, from which claim 33 depends). Since the relationship between the elements recited in new claim 78 have been clarified, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome.

Atty. Docket No.: LYRN002US0
Customer ID No. 58,293

Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claims 32, 34, 36-46, 49 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Silverman et al. is respectfully requested.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's conclusions with respect to the present rejection, the claims have been amended with this response to include the limitations deemed allowable by the Examiner. It is thus respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter set forth in the rejected claims in one or more future patent applications.

Reconsideration of the Examiner's rejection of claims 33 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being unpatentable over Silverman et al. in view of Menezes et al. is respectfully requested.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's conclusions with respect to the present rejection, the claims have been amended with this response to include the limitations deemed patentable by the Examiner. It is thus respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter set forth in the rejected claims in one or more future patent applications.

Should the Examiner have any questions or desire clarification of any sort, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below. Please reference Attorney Docket No. LYRN002US0.

Atty. Docket No.: LYRN002US0
Customer ID No. 58,293

It is believed no further fee is due with this submission, however, if a further fee is due or a credit deemed appropriate, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge such fee or assign such credit to Deposit Account No. 50-3694 of Fortkort & Houston P.C.

Respectfully submitted,
FORTKORT & HOUSTON P.C.

Date: December 18, 2006

By: 

John A. Fortkort
Reg. No. 38,454
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

9442 N. Capital of Texas Hwy.
Arboretum Plaza One, Suite 500
Austin, Texas 78759
Tel: (512) 343-4525
Fax: (512) 343-4530
jfortkort@foholaw.com